

APPROVED
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
NORTHWEST PROGRESSO – FLAGLER HEIGHTS
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD
FORT LAUDERDALE
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE
8th FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM
NOVEMBER 7, 2016 – 2:30 P.M.

<u>Members Present</u>	<u>Attendance</u>
Ron Centamore, Chair	P
Sonya Burrows, Vice Chair	P
Jessie Adderley	P
Leann Barber	P
Alan Gabriel	P
John Hart	P
Mickey Hinton	A
John Hooper	A
Dylan Lagi	P
Steffen Lue (dep. 3:02)	P
Scott Strawbridge	A
John Wilkes (dep. 3:02)	P

Currently there are 12 appointed members to the Board, which means 7 would constitute a quorum.

It was noted that a quorum was present at the meeting.

Staff

Jonathan Brown, Northwest CRA Manager
Bob Wojcik, Planner II
Thomasina Turner-Diggs, NPF Project Coordinator
Sandra Doughlin, DSD/ECR
Glendon Hall, Housing and Economic Development Manager
Mona Laventure, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

Communications to City Commission

None.

I. Call to Order / Roll Call

Chair Centamore called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m. and roll was called.

The following Item was taken out of order on the Agenda.

III. Funding Request / Residential Rehab

Chair Centamore observed that this is the first funding request to come before the Board under the Residential Rehabilitation Incentive program. He pointed out, however, that this program is intended to target clients such as “[an] individual or family that occupies their homestead property,” with an annual income that may not exceed 160% of the area’s median income. Using information from the Broward County Property Appraiser’s Office, he had determined that the property is not owner-occupied or homesteaded.

Ms. Burrows advised that the property owner is seeking to complete work on a house that she plans to occupy. It is not intended to be an investment property. Chair Centamore stated, however, that if it does not meet the guidelines of the incentive program, the request should not be approved.

Mr. Brown commented that the request may be funded under the condition that the property become the owner’s primary homestead upon its completion. Should the owner fail to make this her residence, the funds must be returned to the CRA or the CRA may foreclose upon the property.

Chair Centamore explained that if a property receives funding although it does not meet funding guidelines, it could cast doubt upon the Board’s and the City’s procedures. He suggested that the applicant provide backup material reflecting the applicant’s income. He clarified that this did not mean the Board would see an individual’s personal financial information, but that Staff should be able to verify this information.

Mr. Brown advised that similar conditions would apply to prospective home buyers who do not yet occupy the properties they will seek to purchase. Staff will procure a contractor through a competitive process. Chair Centamore emphasized that the incentive program is worded in a way that suggests the property must already be occupied.

Mr. Gabriel commented that this was the first application for this program that the Board has seen, and they should know how to address this issue in the future. If a property must already be homesteaded before it comes to the Board, it will limit the number of properties that may apply for the program.

Mr. Brown noted that Staff has put together a scope of work for the project which outlines what must be done and its estimated costs. Any exception to the estimated prices must be approved by both the Advisory Board and the CRA Board. He added that this Application may be brought back to the Board at a subsequent meeting if they would like to see more information.

Chair Centamore asked if backup materials can confirm the Applicant has spent on the property over the years are available. Mr. Brown replied that because this occurred over roughly 20 years, there is no way to back up this claim other than looking at the work that has been done.

Mr. Wilkes commented that there is no backup information on the project's current or projected value, how long it has been in place, and other facts that would have to be analyzed in comparison to the parameters of the incentive program. He asserted that if the program is intended to promote improvements made to an existing and occupied homestead property, it does not meet the program's technical requirements.

Mr. Hart stated that the Application presented a conflict to him, as he felt the Board should legitimately assist an individual who has been struggling to build the property over a long period of time. However, he was concerned with making an exception to the program when some of its primary conditions have not been met. He was also concerned that it would be very difficult to recapture funds if that became necessary, as it would require seeking these funds from contractors.

Mr. Brown explained that the contractor is paid using prices based on the scope of work; payment is only released once specific items in that scope have been achieved. He noted that Housing and Community Development has handled over 100 similar contracts and has never encountered this issue.

Ms. Burrows asked if there was another residential incentive program for construction-related requests rather than rehabilitation requests. Mr. Brown responded that the Board may exercise flexibility: items may come before them that are not based on typical incentive programs, such as purchase of City-owned lots within the CRA, because allowing them to remain in their current condition is not in the CRA's best interests. He characterized the project as "rehab-construction," pointing out that if the Board approved the project, their recommendation would be to inform the City Commission of how it deviates from the typical application to the incentive program.

Chair Centamore reiterated that approving the project as presented would go against the intent of the incentive program, and he would like to defer it until some of the Board's questions can be answered. Mr. Hart observed that considering some of the past issues faced by the CRA over several years, they should avoid terminology such as "deviation;" however, he recommended finding alternate language that would provide for a purposeful exception to the program criteria.

Ms. Barber advised that the Board would like to see more projects such as this one, and recommended finding a way to work around objections to the Application, as the Applicant is a longtime resident of the CRA and the property is blighted. She felt it could provide a good example of how the CRA could assist the community.

Mr. Hart continued that as an advisory entity, the Board must feel comfortable with the language and criteria in its incentive programs, and must exercise the responsibility they have to the CRA Board. Mr. Brown replied that the Advisory Board is following the process the CRA Board has put in place with regard to housing and community development, and that Staff must present information to the Board that they will find sufficient.

Motion made by Mr. Wilkes, seconded by Mr. Hart, to defer this Item till the next meeting so [the Board] would be able to acquire additional information. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Mr. Lue and Mr. Wilkes left the meeting at 3:02 p.m.

IV. CRA Visioning

Mr. Brown advised that he would like to see clearer identification of the types of projects suggested by the Urban Land Institute (ULI) Technical Assistance Panel for the highest and best use of parcels. Ms. Burrows pointed out that the report discusses determining the vision that the surrounding community has for the area, and targeting businesses based on this community input. Mr. Brown explained that while the report states this in concept, Staff needs to know the exact businesses to target.

Mr. Brown continued that he wanted to determine whether or not the report is useful in helping to determine site-specific projects that will benefit the CRA. He cautioned that the report may not help bring forward projects that represent the highest and best use.

Ms. Burrows asked if the Board is ultimately seeking to meet the CRA's objective of eliminating slum and blight, or seeking projects for the highest and best use of space. She felt the latter was a broader City objective. Ms. Barber asked how the highest and best use is determined. Mr. Brown explained that if the CRA owns a parcel of land, determining its highest and best use must be an objective. He added that "highest and best use" is a term used by the CRA.

Chair Centamore stated that target projects can be determined through zoning regulations and the ULI report as well as through the wishes of neighborhood associations within the CRA. He felt the Board should seek to blend these three factors together in establishing a vision for the CRA.

Mr. Hart agreed that the highest and best use of a parcel and the desires of the community are not necessarily in conflict with one another. He added that if the community is interested in a specific type of project, that may be its highest and best use for a given parcel.

Chair Centamore recommended that the Board review the ULI report and discuss visioning as an Agenda Item at next month's meeting. Mr. Brown noted that other Agenda Items for the next meeting include further discussion of the Mosaic Group. He added that delaying the visioning discussion will also delay the Marketing Plan unless the Board prefers to adopt the ULI report as its visioning effort for the Marketing Plan.

Ann Marie Sorrell, representing the Mosaic Group, advised that their fee covered a three-year contract with two options to renew. Before the contract was approved and awarded by the City Commission, community input resulted in the stipulation that Mosaic must come back before the Commission every year for renewal. The deliverables and concepts included in their proposal, however, were not for one year, but for a three- to five-year period; however, every year they review this proposal to determine what was or was not accomplished.

In addition, Mosaic has undertaken a Marketing Plan, which will be used to drive activity in the CRA for the next three years or longer. This plan identifies target audiences and how to reach them, the cost of this outreach, different business and community events, a time frame, and a budget. Until they receive additional direction from the Board to complete the Marketing Plan, they will continue to work on the items already provided, including the website, events and initiatives, and newsletter.

Ms. Burrows recalled that the Board may have the option to vote to grant Mosaic an extension so the company's work is not placed on hold. Ms. Sorrell explained that Mosaic's submitted fee was approved, no additional funds have been requested, and all services provided have been within the scope of the contract for three to five years. She was not certain what might be the source of any conflict, but concluded that the company is flexible and will work toward the goals the Board desires.

Ms. Barber recalled that the Board has already voted to recommend approval of the contract. Mr. Brown advised that the City Commission may have felt the Board did not have sufficient time to review the documentation provided. This information will be provided in the members' Agenda packets so they may review it prior to discussion at the next meeting.

Ms. Burrows asked if the CRA Board was privy to information that the Board did not see. Mr. Brown replied that the Redevelopment Advisory Board (RAB) had not seen the scope of work associated with the contract. Mr. Gabriel also pointed out that the Board had not been aware that the City Commission had any issues or concerns with Mosaic. He requested minutes of the CRA Board meetings so the Board might better understand these concerns. Mr. Brown agreed that not all Board members may have been aware of discussions at the City Commission level.

Mr. Brown asked if there were any other materials, aside from the scope of work and the CRA Board/City Commission meeting minutes, that the Board wished to review. It

was confirmed that the members would receive these requested items prior to the next Board meeting.

Ms. Burrows suggested that Staff inform the Board of large projects that may come before them at upcoming meetings, or provide a brief verbal update of their progress. Mr. Brown advised that this may not always be possible. He added that some projects may not want to be announced or discussed until they have worked through certain issues and agreements.

Mr. Lagi proposed placing an update from the CRA Manager on the Agenda so Mr. Brown may briefly review some of the issues and/or items that have come before him, as well as recurring financial reports.

II. Holiday Lighting Update

Mr. Brown explained that the CRA has been asked to identify a vendor for the upcoming Light Up Sistrunk event. Staff is working with the Procurement Office to determine the specifications before this Item goes out for bid. He noted that most similar events are done through the City's Parks and Recreation Department rather than through the CRA; however, the CRA is providing in this project, as they have some investment in the event.

He continued that the CRA will reach out to organizations and agencies such as the Chamber of Commerce, the CRA Office, the NAACP, and others to promote holiday displays in these buildings. The CRA will place displays in the buildings it owns.

Mr. Gabriel pointed out that this is a late time in the season to go out for bid on a holiday event. Mr. Brown advised that Staff was only informed last week of irregularities with the organizations that previously placed bids, which were only recently discovered by the Procurement Office. This caused the bids to be rejected. He was confident, however, that the result would be quality holiday lighting.

V. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 3:32 p.m.

Any written public comments made 48 hours prior to the meeting regarding items discussed during the proceedings have been attached hereto.

[Minutes prepared by K. McGuire, Prototype, Inc.]